

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS washington, DO 20231 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
09/996,415	11/28/2001	Steven A. Van Slyke	83401RLO	4107
759	90 10/16/2002			
Thomas H. Close			EXAMINER	
Patent Legal Staff			BUEKER, RICHARD R	
Eastman Kodak Company 343 State Street Rochester, NY 14650-2201				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1763	,
			DATE MAILED: 10/16/2002	8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	ms s					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/996,415	VAN SLYKE ET AL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Richard Bueker	1763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) Status	N. 1 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely tiled nirty (30) days will be considered timely DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	3 October 2002 .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the applicat	ion.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊡ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	J				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		1				
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
a) The translation of the foreign language [15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	provisional application has	been received.				
Attachment(s)	- (y					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s	5) Notice of	w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/996,415

Art Unit. 1763

Claims 1, 3-6, 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spahn in view of Green and Yamazaki for the reasons stated in the first office action (paper no. 2, mailed Feb.13, 2002). Regarding the newly added recitations of a bias heater power supply and a vaporization heater power supply, it is noted that Spahn's apparatus includes first and second electric resistance heaters, and both heaters have a power supply. While Spahn's two heaters share the same power supply, it is noted that applicants' claims as amended do not require the recited bias heater power supply and vaporization heater power supply to be two separate power supplies, and thus Spahn's power supply for operating two heaters meets the newly added power supply limitations.

Claims 2, 8-14, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spahn in view of Green and Yamazaki and taken in further view of Tanabe and Takagi for the reasons stated in the first office action (paper no. 2. mailed Feb 13, 2002)

Claims 7 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spahn in view of Green, Yamazaki, Tanabe and Takagi, and in further view of Steube for the reasons stated in the first office action (paper no. 2, mailed Feb.13, 2002).

Claims 1, 3-6, 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spahn in view of Green and Yamazaki for the reasons stated in the first office action (paper no. 2, mailed Feb.13, 2002), and in further view of Soden (5,532,102). Soden (see Figs. 5 and 7, and col. 21, line 45 to col. 22, line 63) discloses

Application/Control Number: 09/996,415

Art Unit 1763

a vacuum evaporation crucible source analogous to that of Spahn, Green and Yamazaki. Soden's evaporation source includes a crucible body and a lid defining a linear vapor efflux aperture. Soden's evaporation source includes an electric resistance heater for heating the crucible and a separate electric resistance heater for heating the lid. Soden teaches that both heaters can be heated by the same power source (as in Spahn) or a separate power source can be provided for each heater. Soden teaches that both alternatives provide acceptable results, but that the embodiment using two separate power sources is more desirable because it desirably provides independent control of the two heaters for more operating flexibility. If, for argument's sake, applicants' claims were considered to require two separate power supplies for the recited bias heater and vaporization heater, such would have been obvious, because it would have been obvious from the teachings of Sodden to provide two separate power sources for the two heaters of Spahn to provide independent control and more operating flexibility.

Claims 2, 8-14, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spahn in view of Green, Yamazaki and Soden for the reasons stated above, and taken in further view of Tanabe and Takagi for the reasons stated in the first office action (paper no. 2, mailed Feb.13, 2002).

Claims 7 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spahn in view of Green, Yamazaki, Soden, Tanabe and Takagi, and in further view of Steube for the reasons stated in the first office action (paper no. 2, mailed Feb.13, 2002).